

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6928**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MITCHELL SWAIN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. James C. Dever, III, Chief District Judge. (4:07-cr-00062-D-1; 4:11-cv-00068-D)

---

Submitted: January 21, 2014

Decided: January 23, 2014

---

Before MOTZ, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mitchell Swain, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer P. May-Parker, Ethan A. Ontjes, Rudolf A. Renfer, Jr., Assistant United States Attorneys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mitchell Swain seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

In his informal brief, Swain has failed to address the district court's reasons for denying his motion. Therefore, Swain has forfeited appellate review of the district court's rulings. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED